Labour Monthly

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

LEADING THE WORLD AGAINST HITLER

CONTENTS

Notes of the Month
by R. P. D.
The New War Situation

The Front in the West
by WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.

Leading the World against Hitler
by QUAESTOR

Freedom's Battle
by V. K. KRISHNA MENON

The "Daily Worker" and the National Front
by WILLIAM RUST

AUGUST 1941 VOL. 23 No. 8 6D

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3. Telephone FIN. 5135

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

The New War Situation—The British-Soviet Pact—Munich avenged—Twists and Turns of World History—Responsibilities of Leadership—The Parrot-Cry of "Somersaults"—Then and Now—The Labour Party and Stalin—Ten Years of War-Crisis—The First Phase 1931-39—The Fight for the Peace Front—The Second Phase 1939-41—From Chamberlain to Churchill—Communist Policy in the Second Phase—A Policy to Save the People—The People's Programme—Soviet Policy 1939-41—A Triumphant Vindication—The Turning Point of the War—The Lull before the Storm—June 22, 1941—Why Hitler Struck—Strategic Considerations—Role of Britain and the United States—A Transformation of Policy—And the Reasons—Inescapable Common Interests—The Third Phase of the War—New Political Situation—The Second Military Front—Practical Tasks To-Day.

THE NAZI WAR on the Soviet Union and the British-Soviet Pact of Alliance against Hitlerite Germany have opened a new world situation. We have now entered into the most urgent conflict of our time, in which the fate of the British people and of every people in the world, and the whole future of mankind, are brought on to the battlefield. For the people of this country, for all the peoples of Europe, the greatest and most formidable issues and dangers, but also the greatest hopes, if they fight now in unity with all their strength, are opening out. The assault of Nazi Germany on the Soviet Union brings to a head all those burning issues of our epoch which came to the forefront with the accession of Fascism to power in Germany, now eight years ago. With the war on the Soviet Union Fascism has entered on its supreme gamble. By this attack every people in the world is menaced. Defeat in this war means the certain doom of Fascism. All previous wars, whether reactionary or progressive, even those that have been most crucial for human development, pale into insignificance, not only in scale and intensity, but above all in the magnitude of the issues involved for the whole future of mankind, beside this titanic conflict of the old and the new, between the most colossal military power of reaction ever built up for the enslavement of the world, and the mighty power of the free Soviet people, the representative of the future of humanity, now acting in alliance with the British people, and leading all the peoples of Europe and the world in the struggle for freedom against Fascist enslavement or against the threat of Fascism enslavement. Here in this concrete form, in the battle for the national freedom of the peoples against Fascist enslavement, is expressed to-day at this turning-point of history the conflict for the future of the world. All issues to-day relate themselves to this basic conflict. With the most sweeping survey and realist appraisal of the new alignment of forces, with the fullest consciousness of all that is at stake, it is necessary to draw with a bold and firm hand the new perspectives, in order to reach speedily and plainly the practical conclusions and urgent tasks which now fall before the peoples of all countries and especially the people of this country.

THE BRITISH-SOVIET PACT of July 12, with the plainly defined pledge of mutual aid and no separate peace in the joint war for the defeat of Hitlerite Germany, confirms and strengthens the new alignment of forces. The shift in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the balance of world relations carries with it the most far-reaching consequences. At last that alliance of the British and Soviet peoples, leading the peoples of Europe in the struggle for liberation against fascist aggression and enslavement; that alliance for which the working class and democratic movement in this country, in unity with the Soviet people, strove so many years in vain against the conspirators of world reaction; that alliance which could have prevented the present war; that alliance has now been established even at the thirteenth hour in the midst of war. At last German Fascism, after eight years of victorious advance, made possible mainly by the corrupt assistance of the upper class conspirators in the other countries, meets now a combined front of the peoples. At last German Fascism, after enslaving all the other nations of the European Continent, meets the mighty power of a free people who face it ready and prepared with equal strength; who fight with the knowledge that they fight for no imperialist aims, but for the cause of their own freedom and the freedom of all peoples, including the German people, enslaved by Fascism; and who thereby make these aims the common aims of all peoples engaged in this just war for the defeat of German Fascism.

MUNICH HAS BEEN AVENGED, even in the hour of its seeming victory. The conspirators of Munich built up the military power of German Fascism, and shattered the bastions of peace, in the hope to turn that military power against the Soviet Union. Thereby they let loose a different war. Thanks to their handiwork, which led first to the destruction of the liberties of the other European nations, and then to the most dire peril of the British people, the long-planned criminal offensive of Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union has at length been let loose. The Soviet people, who could have led the world in peace, while holding Fascism in check, had their policy been followed, have now, because of the refusal of their policy, to face the bloodiest ordeal. In place of the bloodless victories of the Peace Front, they have now the grimmer task to show the world how to fight and defeat Fascism, that monster begotten of capitalist reaction and intrigue, which the social and political corruption of the ruling structure in all the capitalist countries first unchained and allowed to ravage the world, and then proved incapable to master. In unity with the peoples of all countries, they and we together will accomplish this task. But this climax towards which the entire policy of the Munichites was directed, and for the sake of which they were prepared to sacrifice the interests of their peoples, has come about under very different conditions from their original dream. The launching of the offensive of Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union, which should have represented the highest point of victory of the whole programme the sponsors of Munich intended to achieve, has instead led to the victory of the very programme they intended to destroy. The launching of the offensive of Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union, in place of being followed by the Munichite dream of the united front of world reaction, has been followed by the British-Soviet Pact of Mutual Aid and the growing unity of the British, American, Soviet and Chinese peoples in the common cause of national freedom and defence against aggression. This is the positive achievement which shows the path of hope and confidence in the present grave hour. We have still to be prepared to go through heavy trials. We have to be prepared for new sharp turns in the present complex situation. But the path is step by step opening out, across all obstacles, for the common victory of the peoples. The logic of history is defeating and will defeat the logic of counter-revolution.

WORLD HISTORY always works itself out with a greater richness and complexity, with more twists and turns, than even the most powerful political insight, the insight of the great masters of Marxism, could attempt to plot out beforehand in detail. In the hour of Munich, when such critical alternatives

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opened out before the world, none could have attempted to lay down with certainty beforehand the precise concrete form in which those alternatives would finally work themselves out. At that turning point the immediate visible alternatives proclaimed themselves in three main forms. Either the victory at the eleventh hour of the Peace Front and the checking of Fascism. Or the victory of the policy of Munich and the launching of combined counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. Or the third alternative, against which the Marxist supporters of the Peace Front gave the most explicit warning, that the refusal of the Peace Front by the Western Powers would give rise, not to the intended war of the combined counter-revolutionary front against the Soviet Union, but to the Nazi offensive to the West and the consequent outbreak of imperialist war in Western and Central Europe. These were in fact the immediate alternatives between which the event revealed the final choice, consequent on the strength of the Soviet Union and the weakness of the popular democratic forces in the West. But who at that time could have ventured to foretell that, when the refusal of the Peace Front had in fact led within less than one year to the outbreak of imperialist war in Western and Central Europe, the very development and consquences of that imperialist war should give rise to a situation in which, at the moment of the launching of the Nazi offensive against the Soviet Union, the alternative common front against Fascism should at last be formed in the midst of war? Such has been the final working out to date of the alternatives which opened at Munich.

SHARP TURNS AND CHANGES are increasingly characteristic of the modern international situation. They are a symptom of the extreme instability and break-up of the old order, and especially of the complications resulting from the parallel development of the imperialist antagonisms for the re-division of the world alongside the existence and growing strength of the new type of State which is outside the system of imperialism and represents the interests of advancing humanity and the future world order. The problems confronting the ruling classes in all countries are daily more acute. In the present world situation, with the growing social and political stress within the old States and Empires, there can be no stability. Ceaseless sharp turns of policy must inevitably be expected, as the leaders of imperialism strive to cleave out a way from their dilemmas, now in this direction, now in that. In the broadest historical sense the avenues of escapes are narrowing for world imperialism. For over a quarter of a century, through the first world war, through Versailles, through the world economic crisis, through Fascism, through Munich, through the second world war, imperialism has been drawing the noose tighter around its neck, and, with each twist and turn to extricate itself, adds a new knot. The forces on our side, the forces of awakening humanity, are growing in strength, are gathering and advancing to that unity which will ensure victory. But in terms of immediate power, of States, of resources, of armies, of technique, of organisation, the balance is still overwhelmingly on the side of imperialism. Therefore the whole present period requires, more than ever before in the history of the working class movement, the utmost skill of leadership, tactical speed, elasticity, boldness of initiative and ability to manœuvre, in order to meet each turn and new situation with a corresponding policy, to prevent any decisive unfavourable combination of forces, and to secure at each point the most favourable combination of forces at the given moment from the standpoint of the interests of the working class and the future of human liberation.

ONLY THE MOST superficial and naive spectators are capable of seeing in these sharp changes of the world situation and the policy of the ruling classes, and the consequent sharp changes which the policy of the working class must carry through in order to meet each new objective situation, not the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demonstration of the instability of imperialist relations and of the correctness of the policy of Marxism, but the triumphant proof in their eyes of the instability of Marxism. The old parrot-cry of "somersaults" is still heard from a few irresponsible critics against the Communist Party. It appears that the Communist Party is accused of "somersaults" because it meets changes in the objective situation with corresponding changes in its policy. A party which failed to do this would not be a Maxist party. This is so elementary that it is painful to need to waste any space in pointing it out. The accusation is as old as Marxism (*e.g.*, the controversy over Marx's reversal of attitude in relation to the successive stages of the Franco-German War of 1870-71). The Bolsheviks at one time denounced a pact with the Liberal Cadets and at another time made such a pact. In the summer of 1917 they demanded the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, and in the beginning of 1918 dispersed it by force. In the autumn of 1917 they denounced Rodzianko's intrigues for a peace with the Kaiser, and in the spring of 1918 they signed a peace with the Kaiser. Every one of these turns raised a howl from their Liberal critics all over the world against their "inconsistency" and "unprincipled opportunism." History has proved their correctness.

IT IS OBVIOUS to every observer that the present international situation is exceptionally full of extremely sharp turns, corresponding to the extreme disorganisation of all capitalist relations, which are by no means finished. Only a little over a year ago the British and French Governments were actively promoting interventionist war against the Soviet Union; they were dispatching planes and guns to Fascist Finland for use against the Soviet Union; they had prepared expeditionary forces to send, and would have sent them had not the collapse of the Mannerheim Line defeated their plans. Germany was at this time maintaining formal friendly relations with the Soviet Union. To-day the German rulers are leading the most violent aggressive war in history against the Soviet Union. The British Government has signed a Pact of Mutual Aid and Alliance with the Soviet Union. Is not this a basic change in the international situation and the relations of the Powers? Is it not obvious that the policy of an intelligent party must change with these changes in the situation, if it is to be really consistent? To demand the same policy in two exactly opposite situations would be the real inconsistency. These myopic critics see the fly and miss the elephant; they see the switch in the policy of the Communist Party, and ignore the switch in the international situation which has called it forth. They would accuse the thermometer of being inconsistent because it registers heat in summer and cold in winter.

A LITTLE OVER A YEAR AGO the official governmental apologia, "The British Case," written by Lord Lloyd with a Preface by Lord Halifax, accused Hitler of the "supreme betrayal" because he had signed a Pact of Non-Aggression with the Soviet Union. To-day Hitler is accusing the British Government of the "supreme betrayal" because it has signed a Pact of Mutual Aid and Alliance with the Soviet Union. Is it not clear that there is here a complete reversal in the relations of forces? A little over a year ago Mannerheim and Tanner were held up as the darlings of Western Democracy and the Second International, and the Soviet strategic action for the protection of Leningrad was denounced as bloodstained aggression. To-day these "heroes" are seen in their true colours, and the justice of the Soviet action is more widely understood. At that time Stalin was denounced by the Labour Party, in its pamphlet on Finland, as "the Red Czar . . . the executor of the traditional imperialism of Czarist Russia . . . an alien and powerful despot . . . gangster . . . . the real depth of the iniquity of M. Joseph Stalin is still unknown." To-day the *Daily Herald* declares (July 5): "Three great figures lead mankind

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the struggle to defend human freedom: Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt." No one in his senses would dream in this moment of supreme crisis and common struggle to launch an attack against the Labour Party on the basis of this change of estimation, or seek to waste time accusing the Labour Party of "somersaults." The only sensible question at the present moment is, not whether there has been a change in policy to meet a change in the situation, but: Is the estimate of the situation correct? Is the policy put forward to meet it correct and adequate?

THE WAR-CRISIS, which has continuously developed and extended, through a long period of incubation, during the past decade out of the consequences of the world economic crisis, and has now advanced, with the attack of Nazi Germany on the Soviet Union, to its highest climax, has passed through three main phases of development, each with its distinctive characteristics, and each with its consequent necessary policy for the working class and for the peoples involved. The first phase, of preparation, during which the world passed imperceptibly, without a sharp distinguishing margin, from peace into war, through a series of extending localised conflicts, into what became in fact by its later stages already possible to be characterised as the second imperialist war, developed from the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in the autumn of 1931 to the Anglo-French declaration of war on Germany in the autumn of 1939. During this phase the initiative was in the hands of the challenging groups of Fascist Powers, Germany, Italy and Japan, who, linked together in what eventually took the form of the "Anti-Comintern Pact," carried forward their aggressive offensive for the new division of the world at the expense of the non-Fascist imperialist Powers in possession, Britain, France and the United States. These Powers, however, in place of opposing this offensive, assisted and encouraged it, and in every way built up the strength of Fascism, conniving at every illegality and aggression, handing it new victims, breaking down the limitations of Versailles and shattering the peace system constructed from the last war, because they hoped to see the offensive of Fascism eventually turned against the Soviet Union. This was the policy which reached its height at Munich and its final fiasco with the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact.

DURING THIS PHASE the task of the working class and democratic movement was to build up the strongest common front, both within each country, internationally, and on the basis of a coalition of States with the Soviet Union for the defence of peace against aggression, or Peace Front, to check the offensive of Fascism and war, prevent its advance to general war and thus win time for the working class and popular forces in all countries to carry forward their struggle, in conditions of peace, to solve the basic social problems at the root of the crisis, which would otherwise inevitably sooner or later give rise to imperialist war. Great struggles were carried forward along this line, in unity with the Chinese, Abyssinian and Spanish peoples, through the People's Front in France and the Franco-Soviet Pact, for the People's Front in Britain and the Anglo-Soviet Pact. The Soviet Union conducted through these years a diplomatic campaign whose initiative and statesmanship won universal admiration, at the same time as they were able to give material help to the Chinese people and to the Spanish people struggling for freedom. To-day it is recognised on all sides that, had this common front, for which the Soviet Union and the militant workers in all countries, together with wide sections of the progressive forces, fought during these critical years, been established in time, the war which broke out in 1939 need never have taken place, or, if it had none the less broken out, would have broken out under the most favourable conditions for the rapid success of the struggle of the peoples.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REACTIONARY RULING CLASS FORCES in the West, however, represented by Chamberlain, were too strong, and were able at that time to prevent this common front being formed. The working class and democratic movement was not strong enough or united enough, or able to find the necessary policy and leadership, or to establish common ground with the opposition minority in the ruling class, to be capable of defeating the dominant Munichite policy and the rule of Chamberlain. Munich laid bare the reactionary plans for the Four Power Front against the Soviet Union. The complicated moves and counter moves of the spring and summer of 1939 did not change the basic situation. Despite Lloyd George's warning, the ill-judged guarantees to Poland and Rumania were adopted without effective backing and without an understanding with the Soviet Union. As late as May, 1939, the Soviet proposal for an Anglo-French-Soviet Pact of Mutual Guarantee was explicitly rejected on principle, on the grounds that it would divide Europe into two camps. On the very edge of the outbreak of war in Europe the Soviet military proposals for the combined defence of Poland were rejected. The Soviet Union, after waiting to the extreme edge of danger to give time for the alternative forces in the West to assert themselves, acted decisively and defeated the counter-revolutionary plans of the Chamberlains and the Daladiers by the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, which succeeded in restricting the sphere of the imperialist war, now made inevitable through the refusal of the Peace Front, and won time for the Soviet Union to prepare and to strengthen its strategic position. The Munichites replied by declaring war on Nazi Germany, as soon as it had signed the Pact of Non-Aggression with the Soviet Union and thus made clear that its offensive would be directed against their imperialist interests. The second phase of the war, the war of the Western European imperialist powers, began.

THE SECOND PHASE of the war, which opened in September, 1939, and extended to June, 1941, bore the character of full imperialist war, even though one camp was the camp of Fascist Germany. This imperialist character of the war followed, not from the sentiments of the people in Britain and France, who were sincerely opposed to Fascism and prepared to struggle for their national independence and the independence of the European nations against the hated Nazi system, but from the very different aims and policy of the ruling classes, which held the power and whose aims governed the character of the war. The dominant pro-Fascist imperialists in Britain and France who entered on the war in the autumn of 1939 still stood for the same basic reactionary aims which they had pursued through Munich. They saw the war, not as war against Fascism, but as war for their imperialist interests against a rival imperialism, and the prelude to anti-Soviet war. For them the "supreme betrayal" of Nazism was not its war on democracy, but its peace with the Socialist State. Even while all was quiet on the Western front, they were actively promoting interventionist war against the Soviet Union. Their official press in the early months openly discussed the possibilities of "switching" the war. For this purpose they advocated a "revolution of the Right" in Germany. Neglecting all serious preparation or intensive rearmament measures during those critical early months, they dispatched the planes and guns, soon to be so sorely needed in the West, to Fascist Finland for use against the Soviet Union, which was engaged in the most urgent military operations in preparation for the future conflict with Nazi Germany. Such was the character of the first stage of the war of 1939, of the "frozen war," during which the ruling classes of the Western Powers, especially in France, directed their main fire, not against the foreign enemy, but against the class enemy at home, against democracy, the Communists and working class organisation, and against the Soviet Union.

AS THE DISASTROUS CONSEQUENCES of this policy made themselves felt in the spring and summer of 1940, with the headlong Nazi advance and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enslavement of the nations of Western and Central Europe, a shift in the balance of relations within the ruling class followed. In France the Munichites and the most open supporters of Fascism carried their policy to its consistent conclusion, threw open the front, disorganised the rear and directly betrayed their country to the foreign enemy in order to maintain their class privileges, even as subordinate agents of a foreign Power. In Britain the Munichite politicians were heavily discredited, but remained strongly entrenched in positions of power. Direct governmental leadership passed into the hands of the alternative section of the ruling class, represented by Churchill, which had consistenly stood for an active policy of opposition to Hitler, and which now opposed the tendencies of capitulation on the lines of France. The aims of this section, while opposed to the policies of capitulation to Hitler, were still the aims of imperialist war against a rival imperialism, and not of a people's war against Fascism. They saw the war as a continuation of the war of 1914 ; their spokesmen, as in the notorious Vansittart pamphlet, insisted that the war was directed, not only against the Nazi rulers, but against the German people ; they proclaimed the aim of a super-Versailles which should impose upon the German people for generations even more onerous terms than the Versailles Treaty whose impositions had sown the seeds for Hitler. Their strategy for victory was based on the alliance with American imperialism, while reactionary influences continuously obstructed every attempt to establish closer relations with the Soviet Union. This policy led to the isolation of the British people from the dynamic forces of the European peoples struggling against Fascism and from the Soviet Union, while involving them in increasingly heavy subordination, in consequence of this isolation, to American finance-capital. It held out the prospect of prolonged, extending and destructive imperialist war, developing over many years and reaching to an imperialist treaty which would sow the seeds of new war. Thus, while the interests of the British people were unalterably opposed to capitulation to Hitler and to the criminal counter-revolutionary policies of the pro-Hitler capitulators in the ruling class, the interests and aims of the alternative section of the ruling class did not correspond to the interests and aims of the people. The problem remained for the people to achieve a policy and leadership which should express their interests, defend them against Fascism at home and abroad and lead the way to a peace on the basis of the freedom of the peoples.

THE TASKS of the working class and democratic movement during this period, in this second phase of the war, consequent on the refusal of the Peace Front, corresponded to these new conditions. The basic task remained to build up the common front of the peoples, in unity with the Soviet Union, for the defence of their interests against Fascism and reaction, for the real democratic anti-Fascist struggle and for the achievement of a durable peace which should be based on the freedom of the peoples. But the failure of the fight for the Peace Front and for the replacement of Chamberlain, and the consequent character of the war thereby launched, basically changed the conditions of this fight in the new phase. There could be no question of applying the conceptions of the Peace Front to the very different war which had arisen through its refusal ; of trailing behind the reactionary imperialist and anti-Soviet aims which were thinly concealed behind a show of anti-Fascist slogans ; of assisting the destruction of democracy and working-class rights, as in France, which paved the way for the victory of Nazism and home Fascism ; or supporting the military measures against the Soviet Union which, as the outcome has shown, were an objective help to Nazi Germany. It was necessary to strike out an independent line, even initially against the stream, in order to make possible the conditions for a real common front of the peoples, in unity with the Soviet Union, for the protection of their interests and the victory of their aims.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THESE TASKS, the Communists and militant popular forces, in the first stage of the new phase of the war which opened in September, 1939, during the "frozen war," while the war was still formal and before actual warfare had begun in Western Europe, strove for immediate peace, on the basis of the proposals put out in the Soviet-German declaration of September 28 for the opening of negotiations, as the best means for saving the peoples of Western Europe from being involved in war, before the irreparable had taken place, and thus winning back the possibility for building the effective common front of the peoples for the prevention of war. This possibility finally disappeared with the extension of the war in Northern and Western Europe in the spring of 1940. The most dangerous situation now confronted the British people in consequence of the disastrous preceding policy. The British people were now facing in isolation the power of German Fascism extending over all Western and Central Europe—the very situation against which the Communists had for many years given warning as the inevitable final outcome of the Chamberlain policy. The paramount question now became how to save the people in the face of this menacing situation.

IT WAS NECESSARY to combat and defeat the policies of capitulation advocated by that section of the ruling class which sought to emulate the example of Vichy, without allowing the struggle of the British people for their national independence to be sacrificed for reactionary imperialist aims which were contrary to the interests of that struggle. From May, 1940, the Communists put forward their concrete programme in this situation how to save and defend the people. Against the policies of both sections of the ruling class, they put forward the proposals for a People's Government, which should organise the democratic defence of the people against Fascism at home or abroad; establish the closest unity with the Soviet Union and the peoples of Europe struggling against Fascist domination; put forward its proposals for a peace based on the freedom of the peoples; and, in the event of those proposals being refused, carry forward the struggle, no longer for imperialist aims, but for the aims of the liberation of the peoples. The victory of a People's Government in Britain, even if it had not been followed by an immediate corresponding victory of the popular forces in Germany, and even if it had in consequence been necessary for a period to continue the war, would have thus meant the transformation of the imperialist war into a people's war against Fascism, conducted in closest association with the Soviet Union. This is in fact the transformation which has now taken place along another route, not by the change of Government in Britain (for this the popular forces were not yet strong enough), but by the new situation resulting from the participation of the Soviet Union in the war and the consequent change in the character of the major forces now participating in and governing the character of the war.

THE VINDICATION of the role of the Soviet Union during these two critical years is now becoming clear even to the blindest. Had the attack of Nazi Germany on the Soviet Union taken place two years ago, in 1939, with Chamberlain and Daladier in power in Britain and France, it is easy to see with what speed the united counter-revolutionary front would have been formed against the Soviet Union. The Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact smashed these plans, and won for the Soviet Union two years for the most intensive preparation. It won time for the peoples in Western Europe to begin to rally their forces, and for a situation to be reached in which the united Munichite front could no longer be formed. It gave time for the Soviet Union to take the most active and boldest strategic measures to strengthen its entire Western frontier. Every one of these measures was at the time abused and denounced by pi-my critics, who remained, not only indifferent to the interests of the liberated peoples

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the territories concerned, but blind to the plain strategic significance of the steps taken in relation to the future struggle against German Fascism. To-day these critics may well give thanks on their knees that these step were taken.

THERE ARE still some lingering voices which seek to refer to these two years of the most brilliant and audacious policy of the Soviet Union as "appeasement." Their guilty consciences over their own past lead them to seek to turn the plain facts upside down. The essence of the policy of appeasement is the successive surrender of interests, territories or peoples in the vain hope of evading or postponing a future conflict, with the final outcome of emerging weakened to face the conflict. The record of the Soviet Union during these two years was the exact opposite. Western Ukraine and Byelorussia; Finland and the protection of Leningrad; the Baltic States; Bessarabia. Every step was a strengthening of the position of the Soviet Union, an extension of its territory, a winning of new peoples to the Union, a thrusting forward of its frontier, a delay to the aggressor. It is only necessary to refer to Hitler's tirade endeavouring to justify his treacherous attack on the Soviet Union to note the continual refrain: "I gave way with a heavy heart . . . I had to be silent . . . I advised acquiescence in the Russian demands . . . this fresh Russian demand . . . continually renewed extortions . . . I remained silent because I was forced to do so" etc. A curious form of "appeasement" on the part of the Soviet Union. These two years of courageous, realist and far-sighted policy of the Soviet Union prepared the way, not only to save the Soviet Union, but to save the peoples of the entire world, by helping to build up that strategic strength and readiness in the West which is to-day meeting the shock of the entire Nazi military machine, showing for the first time how to stand up to that assault, winning thereby hope and the possibility of action for every other people, and constituting the principal—in bitter truth, at present, the only—military barrier between the Nazi dreams of world conquest and the peoples of the world. By their actions during these two years the Soviet people, assailed by thoughtless critics, were in fact performing as signal service to the world as any in all their proud history.

BY THE spring of this year it was clear that the decisive turning point of the war and of the whole development of the modern period was approaching. The war in Europe had reached a temporary deadlock. It was evident that the imperialist war could only go forward as world imperialist war between the Anglo-American coalition and Nazi Germany dominating Europe. But before the imperialists could embark with confidence on such a hazardous enterprise, they were faced with the problem of the independent power of the Soviet Union. As at every sharp turning point of the modern period, the question of the Soviet Union and of relations with the Soviet Union dominated the world situation. It was evident that a heavy and evenly balanced world imperialist conflict of the type contemplated would be likely to prove a protracted war, extending with a widening destructive sweep over a series of years, and leading to incalculable consequences for the whole existing social structure. Already the movement of the peoples was beginning to rise in all countries. Especially, the national movements of revolt were growing in Europe against the hated Nazi domination. The Nazi rulers were the most sharply conscious of the crucial problems with which they were faced. They could least afford to wait. Their military machine was mobilised at its highest point. They must go forward in extending aggression, or go down. They were directly faced with the rising national movements of revolt in Europe. They were acutely conscious of the contiguity of the Soviet Union on their borders, with its socialist peace policy and the advancing prosperity of its people contrasting with the situation of their own war-wracked and enslaved people and embittered subject nations. It

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was from the Nazi ruling circles that the emissary went forth to the opposite ruling camp to try out the possibility of comon ground for action against the Soviet Union. There were currents on thought in both camps which sought the possibility of resolving the conflict on the basis of turning the war against the Soviet Union. But in fact the antagonism of imperialism over the new division of the world, with the forces now fully set in motion on both sides and the final trial of strength still unresolved, was too deep to permit of any such easy solution. The most critical point in modern imperialist development and in the life of the peoples was approaching. From April the Communists gave warning to be prepared for the most sharp and sudden turns in the international situation. On May 6 Stalin took over the direct leadership of the Soviet Government—a change which bore the clearest signal, not only to the Soviet people, but to the international working class and the peoples of all countries to recognise the seriousness of the situation and be prepared.

WHERE WOULD the blow fall? What form would it take? Nazi Germany during these critical weeks was publicly concentrating its armed forces on the borders of the Soviet Union. Would Nazi Germany strike without prior agreement with Britain and the United States? This became the crucial question of the international situation. To this question the voyage of exploration of Hess sought to provide the grounds for an answer. He was the physical embodiment of that old diplomatic term, a *ballon d'essai*. It was on May 10 that Hess landed in Britain to explore the possibilities of collaboration with reactionary ruling circles for the purpose of the proposed attack on the Soviet Union. While the reception of Hess showed that there undoubtedly existed influential reactionary elements prepared to consider such proposals, it also showed that, so far as the Government was concerned, the proposals fell on stony ground. Why Churchill and the authorities deliberately chose to maintain a mysterious silence over Hess, when in fact the proposals had been turned down, remains officially unexplained. Was this silence, with its suggestion of some possible complicity, a trap to lure Hitler forward on his desperate enterprise with the hope of some possible eventual support, only to turn on him with the most positive counter-thrust so soon as he had embarked on it? Had some bright wit of British diplomacy devised the scheme to use Hess as a boomerang and to catch Hitler with his own anti-Soviet bait with which he had so often in the past gulled the British ruling class? Only future records will reveal the details of this episode. What is important for present purposes is that the voyage of exploration of Hess revealed that in fact the basis was lacking for such an agreement. Acceptance of the proposals of Hess, in the existing weakened situation of Britain, would have been equivalent to acceptance of Nazi world hegemony by Britain. There was no road here. The deadlock continued. Only decisive action, in one direction or another, could break it.

ON JUNE 22 Hitler struck. Hitler gave the orders for "the greatest march in history"—against the Soviet Union. In the midst of the war which he had not yet won Hitler took on a new enemy, the greatest military power which was alone capable of standing up to his own. Hitler delivered his treacherous attack on the Soviet Union, not only without a declaration of war, but without the pretence of raising first any issue of disagreement. This meant that the entire calculation was based on the lightning thrust. Hitler struck without any prior agreement with Britain and the United States. Hitler struck against the Soviet Union, while the war against the Anglo-American coalition was still on his hands. This meant that Hitler deliberately took on the possibility of the war on two fronts, against which he had previously made the main political and strategic lesson from the last war and from all German history to avoid, and which only two years before he had directed all his efforts to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prevent. What considerations drove the Nazi rulers to carry through this reversal of their preceding policy and embark on an enterprise which inevitably placed in the scales the future existence of their regime?

A SERIES OF considerations may be judged to have impelled the Nazi rulers to this fateful decision. First, strategic. Nazi Germany could not afford to wait and to see the gradual amassing of the strength and mobilisation of the superior potential resources of the Anglo-American coalition, while the power of the Soviet Union remained unbroken in its rear. The only hope to escape from the net that was closing in became to seek by a lightning thrust to break the military power of the Soviet Union and then to turn to advance against Britain and the United States. Thus the attack on the Soviet Union is the decisive preliminary to the attack on every other people still unconquered by Nazism. The attack on the Soviet Union is the attack on the one effective military barrier which stands between the Nazi rulers and their dreams of world conquest. Thereby the attack of the Soviet Union is the attack on every every people in the world. The second series of considerations derived from the social-political situation. The advancing national movements of the subjugated peoples in Europe, who by no means intended to place their heads under the yoke of either imperialism, but were beginning to look more and more towards the Soviet Union as the representative of the freedom of the peoples, as well as the growth of discontent in Germany among the working masses, confronted the Nazi rulers with sharp problems. Once again they sought to solve their dilemmas by violent action, by a thrust at the fountain head, at the Soviet Union, the free and equal union of free peoples, which had already shown in relation to the Spanish and Chinese peoples its stand by peoples struggling for freedom, and by its example inspired all oppressed peoples with the hope of liberation. Thereby the attack on the Soviet Union is an attack on the national liberation movement of every people oppressed by Fascism. The third series of considerations was diplomatic. By the attack on the Soviet Union the Nazi rulers hoped to divide ruling class opinion in Britain and the United States, on the basis of an appeal to reactionary class sympathies; and by this means to paralyse or weaken their participation in the war, and to delay the entry of the United States into the war.

OF THESE CONSIDERATIONS the most important were those of a strategic character. During the second phase of the war critics and commentators in the Western countries all too often lost to view the world significance of the independent reserve power of the Soviet Union, which exercised its influence, and remained capable of exercising its influence with increasing effect as events developed, on the side of the interests of the peoples and against any and every form of reactionary world domination which might threaten to arise from the military fortunes of the conflict. But Hitler understood this very well. When his legions overran Poland, and the Western Powers remained passive and unable or unwilling to help, it was the Soviet armies that barred his further advance and liberated thirteen millions of people. As soon as the Nazi advance overran Western Europe in the spring and early summer of 1940, leading to a complete shift in the balance and the most acute danger for the British people, it was the Soviet forces whose presence on the Eastern frontiers of Germany restored the balance and saved the British people. In this connection Hitler's own statement with regard to the reason why he was unable to win the Battle of Britain and finally vanquish Britain in those critical months of the late summer and early autumn of 1940 is worthy of note:—

> "While our soldiers from May 10, 1940, onwards had been breaking the power of France and Britain in the west, the Russian military deployment on our eastern frontier was being continued to a more and more menacing extent. From August,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1940, onwards I therefore considered it to be in the interests of the Reich no longer to permit our eastern provinces to remain unprotected in the face of this tremendous concentration of Bolshevik divisions. Thus came about the result intended by the British and Russian co-operation—namely, *the tying up of such powerful German forces in the east that the radical conclusion of the war in the west, particularly as regards aircraft, could no longer be vouched for by the German High Command.*" (Hitler's Proclamation, June 22, 1941).

Thus the crucial role in the Battle of Britain was played by the Soviet Union, whose forces cancelled out the otherwise overwhelming Nazi air superiority, enabled the R.A.F. to stand up to the remaining Nazi air forces and saved Britain from an annihilating assault. To-day the British people will understand better the debt they owe to the Soviet people, not only at this moment, but also during these preceding two years. Thus the attack of Nazi Germany on the Soviet Union is in fact the attack on the main military barrier to its dreams of world conquest. With the attack of Nazi Germany on the Soviet Union the war passed from its second phase into the third phase, the war of German Fascism for the enslavement of the world.

AS SOON AS NAZI GERMANY launched its attack on the Soviet Union, and thus opened the most gigantic and fateful military conflict in history, the critical question of the international situation became at once the attitude of Britain and the United States. Would the Nazi calculations to spread dissension in these countries, play on anti-Soviet ideological sympathies, and thus divide them from the Soviet people, cut them off from the alliance which could save them, and paralyse them in the decisive world conflict, win any success? That the heart of the people would rally on the side of the Soviet people was certain. The last unofficial poll in the earlier months of 1939 had shown 87 per cent. of the population in favour of an Anglo-Soviet Pact, at a time when it was still being resisted by the Government. But would the understanding of the most far-sighted representatives of the ruling class equally recognise the common interests, over-riding social and political differences, defeat the Nazi trap and proclaim the common cause in the present struggle? To this question Churchill's broadcast of June 22 gave the emphatic answer. Churchill,speaking on behalf of the Conservative Party and the National Government, made clear that he had not changed his standpoint with regard to the social and political system of the Soviet Union or with regard to Communism, but that in this conflict he recognised a common cause and a common enemy: "One aim and one single irrevocable purpose—to destroy Hitler and every vestige of the Nazi regime . . . we will never parley, we will never negotiate with Hitler or any of his gang. . . . . Any man or State who fights against Nazism will have our aid . . . we shall give whatever help we can to Russia and to the Russian people. . . . . The Russian danger is our danger and the danger of the United States." This was the speech which Stalin referred to as Churchill's "historic utterance." There followed on June 23 the declaration of Sumner Welles on behalf of the United States: "In the opinion of this Government any rallying of the forces opposing Hitlerism, from whatever source they may spring, will hasten the downfall of the German leaders, and will therefore be to the benefit of our own defence and security." On June 24 came the announcement by Eden of the agreement of the British and Soviet Governments to co-operate on a reciprocal basis, followed by the exchange of Missions, and finally the signing of the British-Soviet Pact of Mutual Aid and Alliance on July. Hitler had had his answer.

SHARP AS was the reversal of policy of the Nazi rulers, who in the preceding years leading up to 1939 had devoted all their efforts, first by the collaboration with Chamberlain, and then by the Non-Aggression Pact with the Soviet Union, to prevent and avoid by every means the war on two fronts, and now in 1941 by their own action had plunged into the war on two fronts; no less

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sharp was the reversal of policy of the British ruling class, who in those same years had devoted all their efforts to promoting war of Nazi Germany on the Soviet Union, and now, when that war had broken out, had ranged themselves with the Soviet Union. It was indeed an ironic commentary on the whole preceding policy of the Clivedenite lords and ladies and the pro-Hitler magnates of the City, who had ruled the roost during those years, who had applauded Chamberlain and denounced Churchill, who had acclaimed Hitler as their darling and their champion against Bolshevism, that now, when at last they were to witness their erstwhile knight and champion proceed on his so called "anti-Bolshevik crusade," they should find themselves unable to accompany him; that, after they had for so many years been bilked by false promises and sacrificed so much to see the longed for and constantly deferred war of Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union, now at last, when it broke out, they should find themselves compelled, under the leadership of the politician they had denounced, to march in a common front with the Soviet Union. Such was the answer of the event to the poisoned dreams of Munich.

WHAT LAY BEHIND this transformation? Two years of history. Two years of deepened crisis of British imperialism. Two years of bitter defeats and humiliations consequent on the whole preceding policy, the refusal of the Anglo-Soviet Alliance and the resulting isolation and weakness. It is only necessary to recall the situation immediately preceding the new events, the debates in the House of Commons during May and June, the anxiety following the evacuation of Greece and Crete, the revelations of unpreparedness, the facts of production, the slowness of the American aid, the dissensions, vacillations and alarms in the ruling class, the accusations of Petainism against leading political representatives, the new motto which had begun to find currency in the popular press that "we may lose the war," to recognise how critical was the situation to which the British people had been brought by the faults of their rulers. In this situation the Anglo-Soviet Alliance was no longer a question of political controversy; it was an imperative necessity forcing itself on the recognition of all; not a dissentient voice dared to make itself heard. The Anglo-Soviet Alliance came as a salvation and a new hope, inspiring new confidence in the people. Gone were the old days of grudging and patronising recognition. The very existence of the British people is now bound up with this Alliance. It would no doubt have been better if this understanding had come earlier; if it had come six years ago, when this Alliance was first advocated by the Communist Party; if it had come five years ago, four years ago, three years ago, even two years ago, when it could still have prevented the present war. But it may be that only the ruthless teaching of experience could have created this wide and general understanding. War is a harsh political school which compels its lessons to be learnt quickly or not at all. The Anglo-Soviet Alliance is based, not only on the deep friendship of the peoples, now strengthened by the sense of partnership in a common struggle against a hated and reactionary enemy, but also on the powerful immediate foundation of inescapable common interests in an hour of grave danger, when the greatest possible unity is indispensable for victory. This alliance of the British and Soviet peoples, leading all peoples in the struggle for liberation against Fascism, must now become the rock and the anchor for the salvation of the British People, and be carried forward through the present days of trial to victory and to lay the basis for a better future.

FOR THE BRITISH RULING CLASS the Anglo-Soviet Alliance is the expression of common interests in an urgent immediate struggle. In the calculations of a ruling class there is no room for sentiment; but there is room for the recognition of practical common interests. In isolation Britain is not able to defeat

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nazi Germany, and is faced with the most acute immediate peril. The American aid takes time to become effective, and the peril is immediate; further, the American aid is bound up with onerous conditions in respect of the concessions, economic, political and strategic, which have to be made. The Anglo-Soviet Alliance strengthens the position of the British ruling class in relation to the American ruling class. Undoubtedly for the ruling class there are also ulterior calculations; and only the politically naive would be blind to them. They are well aware that the colossal conflict of all the forces of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union weakens both, while their own forces and the American forces are temporarily immune; and they look forward to a future perspective in which the Anglo-American forces will be able to ensure those social and political conditions which they regard as representative of civilisation and order, but on which the masses of the people and the nations oppressed by Fascism will have other views when the time comes. These issues of the future will be settled by the peoples; and their power to settle them in their own interests will depend on the strength of their active struggle to-day. But these issues of the future must not be allowed to stand in the way of the maximum unity and maximum common effort of all forces opposed to Hitlerism in the present struggle, when *every source of strength and every ally, irrespective of social and political outlook*, is needed for the defeat of the common enemy.

THE WAR OF NAZI GERMANY on the Soviet Union and the British-Soviet Alliance have transformed the world situation and the political situation in every country. Every issue needs now to be judged in the light of this supreme conflict. The second phase of the war, the reactionary war of the Western imperialist Powers for the new division of the world has passed into the third phase of the war, the just war for the liberation of the peoples against German Fascism. The imperialist rulers remain in power in Britain; they still oppress India and the colonial peoples; they maintain their class system in Britain; they still maintain their imperialist aims. But the objective significance of their war against Hitler has now become a part of the just war represented by the Soviet Union in association with the peoples oppressed or menaced by Fascism for liberation against Fascism. This is the vital issue which is now the common concern of every people in the world, including the colonial peoples, who have still to win their own freedom, but who are equally and unconditionally interested in the victory of the Soviet Union and the defeat of Fascism. The Soviet Union has no imperialist interests or aims; the Soviet Union has from the first day of the conflict made clear that it regards the war as war against the Nazi rulers, not against the German people; it has made clear that victory carries with it the liberation of all peoples oppressed by Fascism. In this way the participation of the Soviet Union has transformed the character of the war, and opened the way to the participation of all the peoples oppressed by Fascism, in the common struggle for their liberation, with the sure confidence that the strongest Power which is taking part in the fighting will equally protect the interests of their liberation in the final settlement. The way is opened for the British people, fighting alongside the Soviet people, to range themselves for the same common aims of a peace based on the freedom of the peoples.

THE BRITISH-SOVIET PACT equally transforms the political situation in this country. Here also every issue needs to be judged anew in the light of the new conditions and present needs. The Prescript attached to last month's Notes was written and dispatched immediately following Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, and prior to Churchill's speech, and was consequently out-dated, by the time it appeared, by Churchill's speech and the subsequent developments. Churchill's speech, Eden's speech and the steps culminating in the British-Soviet Alliance brought a new political situation. The Churchill Government has now

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signed a Pact of Alliance with the Soviet Union. The Churchill Government has proclaimed the policy of joint war with the Soviet Union for the defeat of Hitlerite Germany. Since this issue is the decisive issue to-day, over-riding all other issues, it is obvious that these facts must govern the attitude of all class-conscious workers and the militant Left at the present moment to the Churchill Government, however much they may differ from it on other questions or be opposed to the political standpoint of the individual members composing it. Without regard to such differences, we give the most wholehearted support to the Churchill Government in every measure it adopts in the fulfilment of this policy. We demand of the Churchill Government the most active fulfilment of this policy, and we pledge the fullest co-operation and support in its fulfilment. Our fire is directed, not against the supporters of the Pact, but against its opponents or those who seek to sabotage it. This is the decisive political criterion at present.

THE URGENT NEED NOW is the fullest mobilisation and active unity of all sections of the people for the fulfilment of the tasks of the common struggle with the Soviet people for the defeat of Hitler. We strive for the united national front of all sections of the people (not only of the Left anti-imperialist or pro-Soviet elements, but of all opposed to Hitler and supporting the Pact) to drive forward the maximum effort in the joint war with the Soviet Union for the defeat of Hitler. *The Alliance needs to be made effective with the fullest strength of the British people.* We cannot be satisfied with a situation in which one partner to the Alliance is bearing the entire brunt of the fighting, while the other remains inactive in a military sense. We cannot be proud of a situation in which the Soviet Union in isolation is engaging nine-tenths of the military forces of Nazism, while the remaining tenth, containing mainly the older and invalid elements, is thinly spread over the occupied countries, and the entire might of the British Empire, with sea power at its command, finds it beyond its strength to attempt to engage or even harry the tenth. That is a very unequal and one-sided alliance. As the terrific battle goes forward in the east, the question of the military second front becomes every day more pressing.

WE NEED TO COMBAT the widespread passivity and complacency which is as fatal as it is short-sighted. We need to awaken the people to the urgent sense of their own peril, to the understanding that their fate depends on what is done now. The same spirit which animates the Soviet people, that spirit of invincible dynamic energy, unsparing common endeavour and single-minded purpose, overcoming every obstacle, needs to be emulated here. The disorganisation of production cannot be tolerated, but, despite the limits of the existing structure of industry, needs to be combatted with that burning urgency which can compel action even from the most lethargic and incompetent authorities. All this can only be accomplished to the extent that the masses of the people themselves, and the organised workers in the first place, act, push, drive and take the initiative, both politically and in the sphere of production, industry and social organisation. Within the broad national front the working class and democratic movement must necessarily be the driving force; the need for working class unity and the revived activity of the labour organisations is greater than ever. It is necessary to be prepared for the sharpest issues of every type in front. The present situation, in which every day is carrying the fate of all peoples in the balance, calls for the greatest effort. The strength of the initial stand of the Soviet people against the onslaught of the Nazi military machine has given rise to the most dangerous false confidence and illusions here. Our concern and responsibility is to see that the people of this country do their full part and pull their full weight in the common alliance. This is the single practical task which governs every activity to-day. **R. P. D.**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Front in the West

BY WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.

THE PEOPLE of this country are facing at this moment the greatest crisis in their history. The gravity of the issues must be plainly stated so that none will fail to realise their meaning and all will act with resolution and determination. German Fascism, aiming at nothing less than the domination of the entire world, has turned the entire might of its armed forces to the East in a bloody and desperate attempt to strike down the Soviet Union. Never before in history was there such a vile and treacherous attack. Never before in history was there such a monstrous attempt to pillage and destroy, and to bring the people of many lands under the heel of a gang, whom Stalin has fittingly described as "monsters and cannibals."

The strategical plan of the German Fascists, drunk with power and mad with the lust of conquest, is to cripple the forces of the Soviet Union and then to hurl the full fury of their Panzer divisions and Luftwaffe against the people of Britain and America. And in this period of history, such plans are not slowly unfolded over months and years but are dependent on the success of lightning, treacherous blows, which must bring their final result in days and weeks.

France was conquered in the short space of thirty-one days. It was rotted from within before it was conquered from without. Hitler prepared for the invasion of Britain, but he feared to move because of the might of the Soviet Union, and his fear that the people of Britain would finally succeed in finding their way to unity with the people of that great country. The Soviet Union could not be cowed by threats or appeased by promises of a share in the spoils. German Fascism, fearful of the unity of the British and Soviet people, decided to strike at the Soviet Union in the hope that a victory achieved by treachery would then free its hands for the enslavement of Britain.

These are the grim realities which every man and woman in Britain must understand. They show that there is no such thing as a Soviet fight on the one hand and a British fight on the other. There is only one fight, that of the people of both countries for their independence and against enslavement and national degradation. In the historic words of Stalin:

> "Our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggles of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties. It will be a united front of the peoples standing for freedom and against enslavement and the threat of enslavement by Hitler's Fascist armies."

The realisation of this has already brought about a transformation of the situation in Britain and in other parts of the world. The Government was quick to recognise that the future of this country depends entirely upon the extent to which we fight shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union. The old issues which had divided the people, and which had created distrust between the people and the Government disappeared almost overnight. Th Anglo-Soviet Alliance, which progressive opinion had advocated for years on end, was rapidly concluded There arose a new hope, a belief in victory over Fascism. The people felt that these days of danger were also days of glorious opportunity. Alliance with the Soviet Union brought new confidence not only to the people of Britain, but also to the enslaved peoples of the Continent.

It is with a full understanding of the meaning of these new days that we address grave words to the working people of Britain and not in any spirit of carping criticism.

We are not doing enough. We have made only the first beginnings with those things that are vitally necessary if victory is to be won. The Government must be fully supported in the carrying out of the alliance with the Soviet Union for victory over Hitlerite Germany. But support means much more than passive acceptance. It means the democratic activity of the people to ensure that the decisions of the Government are really carried into effect and that the alliance is made a reality.

The first and immediate test of the alliance is in the military sphere. In the present situation this means the creation of a second front against German Fascism, the striking of hammer blows in the West commensurate with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

colossal fight now being waged by the Red Army in the East. The entire world stands in admiration before the glorious heroism of the Red Army and the Soviet peoples. Never before have the Panzer divisions encountered such a resistance. The legend of the invincibility of the German Army has been destroyed. Entirely new fighting methods have been developed by the Soviet armies, who are waging a deathless struggle in defence of their Fatherland and the new life created during these twenty-four years in place of the foul and rotten system of Tsardom. There are no "incredible mistakes" committed before Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev as there were in France one year ago. There are no hordes of leaderless and hopeless refugees. The people are united with the army. The people, as well as the soldiers, are fighting the invaders. The tactics of the "scorched earth" are depriving the Fascists of the advantages usually gained by an advancing army.

But we must be realists. The Soviet people are in need of all the help that Britain can give. Admiration and moral support is not enough. It must be translated into military action. The creation of the second front against Fascism is the burning question of the hour. And the quicker we act, the quicker their victory and ours. The longer we delay, the more difficult their situation and ours. No greater help could be given to Fascism to-day than a policy of sitting back and waiting on the part of Britain. We are not the spectators of a mighty scene, but the front rank fighters in freedom's greatest battle.

And if this second front in the West is the need of the hour, and no one dare deny that it is, then it is also clear that the weapons for this front must be provided with the utmost urgency and speed. The stirring call to action made by the People's Convention declares that just as there can be no quiet on the Western front, so can there be no quiet on the factory front. There must be a vast increase in the supply of tanks, aeroplanes and guns for victory. All obstacles to production must be overcome.

Parliamentary debates have revealed to the public at large the shocking state of our war industries, facts long known to the industrial workers, who have made many efforts to end the mismanagement and inefficiency which is the principal cause of this extremely dangerous state of affairs. The Government is engaged in a number of administrative measures for the purpose of bringing about improvements. But this is only one side of the problem, which will not be solved unless the initiative and enthusiasm of the workers is given full scope. The men and women, upon whose skill and ability the success of production depends, are keen to bring about the sweeping changes that are so urgently required, as witness the resolutions passed by shop stewards and factory committees. One striking example of this desire is the conference of forty war factories called by stewards of Fairey's Manchester factory, where the whole problem of production was thrashed out in a vigorous and practical manner.

This action is an example to all parts of the country.

But there are many employers who do not welcome such steps, who do not understand the new times and the necessity of placing patriotism before profits. They have to be made to understand that there is no better guarantee of results in industry than the extension of trade union rights and the maintenance and improvement of living standards. The workers must be free to speak, write and act for the anti-Fascist cause, without fear of victimisation or prosecution. Above all, it is necessary to face and solve the problem of food supplies and to see that there is an equitable distribution of the available resources.

In these vital days when the fate of all peoples is being decided, the workers of Britain will not hesitate to make sacrifices for the common cause just as their Soviet allies are doing. But there is nothing more calculated to sap the morale of the workers than the spectacle of muddle and confusion in food supplies, and the marked advantages that idle, well-to-do individuals enjoy over the producers at the bench and in the pit. More food can be produced in this country, distribution can be organised far more efficiently and equitably, profiteering and speculation can be wiped out. The profiteers are Hitler's Panzer division in Britain. They must be treated as such. This is the way to build up the anti-Fascist unity of the people, and to create a national front, capable of withstanding all the blows of the enemy. This front must be sustained by a vigorous propaganda and political activity as well as by the satisfaction of the material needs of the people. For two years the Ministry of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Information has been a laughing stock. In four weeks the Soviet Information Board won universal admiration. Why? Because the Soviet propagandists set out to win the support and sympathy of the German people. Never once during these two years did we bring a German prisoner to the microphone. The Ministry of Information preferred to threaten the German people with the ravings of a Vansittart, a racial incitement that drove the Germans into the arms of Hitler and was nothing more or less than a gift for Goebbels.

Whilst working for changes in the method and approach of the Ministry of Information, the people must develop their own propaganda and not leave it to the officials on high. To the extent that the anti-Fascist movement develops in this country, publishes a broad, popular literature and organises a great network of public meetings it will be possible to stimulate the fighting spirit of the people and to create a will to victory that will be felt far outside the boundaries of this country. All democratic organisations should be drawn into this activity and broad platforms arranged, followed by the establishment of representative united front committees able to organise and lead the mass movement and to strengthen the Government in its fight for the overthrow of Hitlerite Germany.

We must never forget that we have many allies within Germany itself. The manifesto of the German Communist Party (of 24th June) declares:

> "Our enemy is in our own country. The Fascist slaveholders, the big capitalists—these are our enemies. The victory of the Red army and of the oppressed peoples fighting for their national freedom will also be the victory of the German people. In our hands—in the hands of the creative German people—now lies the fate of our country. Our people's honour is outraged by the domination of bloody Fascism. We shall be strong if we close our ranks. We have friends and allies in all lands enslaved by Germany, who again wish to secure their freedom. Working people! Come out against the criminal war.

From France there comes a stirring call to all French people to unite with Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States in the fight to regain national independence. The Communist Party of France calls the people to action:

> "Our workers, our miners, will not confine themselves to demonstrations, slogans and partial stoppages of production. They know that everything must be done to bring the Hitler war machine to a halt. And they will do it. . . . Our efforts are pledged to unite our people for a fierce struggle against the foreign invaders and Vichy traitors. . . . In concerted struggle, fighting side by side with all free men and nations, in solidarity with the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States, French people will regain their national independence. Fascism will be wiped off the face of the earth and the French people will again acquire the liberty they won on 14th July, 1789."

These are the messages that pour in from all parts of the world, from China, Australia and America as well as from Germany and France. They express the conquering spirit of the working people, who are gaining confidence in their own strength and whose heads are bloody, but unbowed.

In his remarkable article entitled "The Myth of German Invincibility," the Red Army General, M. Khozin, proves conclusively that the German victories of 1939 and 1940, "were won not so much by their own forces as by base treachery in the countries against which they fought." This analysis is of vital importance because it is both an exposure of the terrible menace that the Fifth Column represents and a proof that the living forces of the people are sound and vital, and that the people will be able to turn the tables completely when properly organised and led.

We in Britain are still on our feet. We have endured much during these last two years, but our sufferings have been small compared with the outrages imposed on the enslaved peoples of Europe. Fortunately, there is still time for us to learn from what they have undergone. We must be on our guard against our own Fifth Column, all of whom have not yet been sent off to the Isle of Man. We must overcome weakness and apathy in our own ranks.

It would be true to say that many people in Britain do not yet understand the dangers that threaten and can overcome them. There is still a strong tendency to go on as if nothing has changed, as if everything can be left to the Red Army. There are some political leaders, who think that these times are merely a further opportunity of paying off old political scores. Their narrow, party attitude still predominates because they do not understand that unity is our only salvation.

Let us root out the chief danger in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our own ranks, namely, apathy and failure to understand the mighty tasks imposed by history upon each and every one of us. Let us direct our blows against the chief enemy, namely, those British Quislings who will seek to betray the people to Fascism, and even now are working secretly in our midst. There is not a moment to lose. Fascism strikes its blows unceasingly. Japan has already grabbed new territory. The blow may fall on Turkey at any moment. Britain must strike harder and quicker than Fascism. Above all, the front in the West must be established without a moment's delay.

Leading the World Against Hitler

BY QUAESTOR

THE most stupendous issue in the history of the working class movement has been raised by the Fascist attack on the Soviet Union. That issue is not only the life or death of the first Socialist State, but the fate of the entire movement of the human race towards its emancipation. The struggle of the Paris Commune was a tiny episode in comparison with this issue. It is timely, perhaps, to strip off the dross and irrelevancies in which the capitalist Press has smothered the question, and to view it in the light of Marxist and Leninist principles.

Marxists and Leninists mean what they say when they speak of the international proletariat. Unlike reformists, they really do see identity in the interests of the working class in every country. Likewise they really believe in the struggle of the vast majority of the human race for emancipation—that army (far vaster than the proletariat), of peasantry, exploited middle strata, colonial peoples who stand behind the international proletariat in social development and in political consciousness, but whose struggle at times is just as revolutionary and destructive of the capitalist order as the proletarian struggle is all the time. At the head of this great army, numbering over 2,000 millions—the vast majority of the human race—stands the Soviet Union. In the Soviet Union the workers and peasants differ from other workers and peasants in this respect, that they have held and wielded State power in one huge country for over 23 years, transforming their country in the course of that time, and above all immeasurably multiplying their own strength and capacities.

Thus the Soviet Union is not merely one Socialist State, or the multi-national State of the workers and peasants in one-sixth of the globe; it is these things and more. It is the advance guard of the whole of humanity, in a special position for that very reason.

Wielding this immense State power, the Soviet working class (and now the entire Soviet working people) have from the first been able to do one thing that other sections, more backward and weaker, were unable to do with anything like the same effectiveness. That was to manoeuvre, to use the inestimable advantage of the machinery of a great State, in order to neutralise or weaken attacks on the international army of the exploited, by utilising the inevitable divisions in the ranks of capitalism. Sometimes the Soviet Union was able to do this in the interests of general peace—as at the Disarmament Conference of 1932, and in its proposals for a peace bloc. Sometimes it was able by these means to come directly to the aid of one people or other which had been attacked by robber imperialism—as in Spain from 1936, or in China since 1937. From time to time the Soviet Union has been able to contribute in this way to its own defence, as by the Rapallo Treaty with Germany in 1922, or by its various Pacts of non-aggression (the principal safeguard always being, however, the Red Army and the direct support of the international working class).

Always and everywhere, however, this breathing space from the time of the last great attack on the Soviet Republics (1918/20) was just as important for the world at large as it was for the U.S.S.R. The general interest coincided with the interests of the U.S.S.R. The preservation of the U.S.S.R. was throughout

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this period the preservation of the achievements of that section of humanity which had gone farthest towards emancipation, and which in doing so had greatly increased the fighting effectiveness of the army of exploited.

This was just as true in September, 1939, as at any other time since the November Revolution. What made the war which broke out in that month an imperialist war—just as much on the Allied side as on the German—was not only the fact that on both sides the war was controlled and organised by a class of imperialists in their own interests (the Allied imperialists holding their empires, and the German imperialists wanting to divide them afresh). It was also the special responsibility of the Allied imperialists, in rejecting the chance of preserving peace provided by the existence of the U.S.S.R., with its special strength and ability to manoeuvre as the strongest detachment of the world's toilers. It was an imperialist war, among other things, just because the Allies deliberately rejected the possibility of co-operation for peace with a State which represented at one and the same time the vanguard of the world proletariat and the vanguard of the oppressed of the world. Peace secured by these means would truly have been a peace in the interests of humanity as a whole, even though a large and powerful section of the world's imperialists would have been (temporarily and for their own purposes) co-operating.

German imperialism, on the contrary, for its own reasons limited the scope of the war for the time being, by accepting a peace arrangement with the Soviet Union. This temporarily excluded a large section of the world from the war. Although the Soviet Union, therefore, had been unable to achieve the larger aim of saving the whole world from war, its special position had proved sufficient to gain some advantage for at least a section of the European peoples.

Let this be remembered when the ignorant or prejudiced attack Communists for tuning their policy to the needs of the Soviet Union. The needs of the Soviet Union, because of its special position, are the needs of the peoples of all other countries, including those of Great Britain—for the reasons already indicated. It would indeed be a peculiar thing if the rearguard of a great army did not listen to the guidance of the leading section of that army. Does that mean, then, that the Communists admit to being "agents of a foreign Power"? No, it does not. The Soviet Union is not a foreign Power for the workers and the common people. On the contrary, it is the Soviet Union which is the agent and representative of the working people of other countries, including Great Britain. When Mr. Churchill talks about the British Communists in opprobrious terms, as he is reported to have done, because they "would not fight for their own country, and only turn round because Russia is attacked," he is talking nonsense. The Communists, in production and in the fighting forces, were never saboteurs: but in fighting the anti-Soviet and imperialist policy of the British ruling class during the first, or imperialist, phase of the present war, they *were* fighting for their own country, while Mr. Churchill was fighting for the rule of the Bank of England.

For the situation in the whole world has been radically changed, and with it has been changed the character of the war by Hitler's extension of it to the Soviet Union. While the imperialist aims of the British and Allied ruling classes remain the same, objectively their continuation of the war is now an adjunct to the just war of the Soviet Union, i.e., of the vanguard of 2,000,000,000 people against Nazi aggression. Hitler has succeeded in knocking out his capitalist rivals on the Continent of Europe, but he has good reason for fearing the revolt of the enslaved peoples. That revolt might well prove too strong for him, were it allied to the Soviet Union in war, or were it utilised by a strong Anglo-American coalition. The attack on the Soviet Union might, if the gamble were successful, eliminate the one danger, and at any rate, might weaken the Anglo-American combination, by arousing the sympathetic activity of pro-Nazi and anti-Soviet fifth columnists in both Great Britain and the U.S.A. These were the obvious calculations of the Nazi leaders. The important thing to notice is that the real threat to Hitler for months, and perhaps years, ahead came from the potential coalition between the Soviet Union in arms and the revolting peoples of Europe.

Thus, from primarily an imperialist war, we see developing primarily a war between the whole of humanity, championed by the Soviet Union as its vanguard, and the most aggressive and successful imperialist State. In comparison with this basic conflict, all others fall into the background. The self-preserva-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the peoples in all countries dictates that they should take part in this just war of the Soviet Union on their behalf, to the utmost of their power. Of course the form in which they should take part must vary according to their several positions. In Germany, the weapons are sabotage, desertion, mutiny, preparations for revolution. In the occupied countries they are sabotage, the mobilisation of all patriotic elements of the nation against the Germans, the maximum facilitation of Allied victory (which now includes Soviet victory), preparations for rebellion. In neutral countries the task is national mobilisation for support of the U.S.S.R., and the fight against the pro-Hitler elements. In Great Britain it is the diplomatic, economic and military mobilisation of the people for the maximum effective joint war with the Soviet Union—a mobilisation which integrally and necessarily involves the most bitter struggle against pro-Fascist anti-Soviet and anti-popular traitors, whether in industry, in diplomacy or in the war machine.

Obviously there is no question here of mechanically and parrot-like repeating the formulae regarding imperialist war which arose out of the 1914-1918 experience. Obviously the first concern of the proletariat in an imperialist country fighting the Soviet Union is to procure the defeat and overthrow of its own Government, turning the imperialist war into a civil war. The first concern of the proletariat in other imperialist countries, on the other hand, must be the defence of the Soviet Union, whose defeat would be a terrible blow not only for the proletariat of all countries, but for humanity in general. Every act of the proletarian struggle has to be subordinated to this supreme aim of procuring the victory of the U.S.S.R., which would mean a great stride forward of the people's cause in every country.

It is worth noting that the draft programme of the Communist International, adopted as a basis at the 4th World Congress in 1922, recognised that the establishment of the first Socialist State had changed the situation so far as the question of defence of the fatherland was concerned: and pointed out that blocs between proletarian States and bourgeois States, against other bourgeois States, were admissible in principle. The further draft, adopted as a basis at the 5th World Congress in 1924, declared that, as the seizure of power by the proletariat does not take place in all, or even the most important States simultaneously, and proletarian States exist side by side with capitalist States, "such compromises and agreements (up to and including military agreements) are not only admissible but sometimes even obligatory." Neither of these drafts, however, laid down the policy that the workers should pursue in the capitalist countries concerned; and at the 6th Congress of the Communist International in 1928, when the Programme was finally adopted, the peril was rather one of a world coalition against the U.S.S.R. than of an attack by a section of the imperialist Powers. The problem has to be faced now, at a time of mortal peril for the peoples of every country, and the solution will not wait for long academic discussion.

Does that mean that the character of British imperialism has changed? Of course not. The British capitalists still exploit the British working class. India and the other colonies are still enslaved. They still use the capitalist ways of waging war. Their war aims are still to break up rival empires. They still allow considerable freedom of action to the pro-Fascist and anti-Soviet elements in the B.B.C., the War Office, newspapers like the "Daily Mail," the diplomatic service and so on. Those would be fools who shut their eyes to these facts. But that is not the supreme criterion at this moment. Those who see in Churchill's speeches about the U.S.S.R. only the empty words of a capitalist politician are just as short-sighted as those who would fall into the uncritical enthusiasm that such a great man has "come over to our side."

The interests of the British imperialists temporarily coincide with those of the Soviet Union, and therefore with those of the British people. In reality, that is a mild way of putting it. They see ruin and destruction staring them in the face if the Soviet Union is not victorious in its war with Nazi Germany. It is not mere clever tactics when Churchill gives his pledges on the B.B.C. and in the House of Commons, but the compelling interests of self-preservation. Furthermore, the obligations of such a position force the British ruling class to yield many concessions to the deep sympathy which the British people and the millions of India and the colonies feel for the U.S.S.R. This strengthens those peoples and hampers their enemies in the struggle of the people for freedom. The very openness with which the pro-Fascist and anti-Soviet elements have been forced to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

act (for example, the "Daily Mail" campaign against the U.S.S.R. begun after the Germans had attacked, the manoeuvres of the B.B.C. Governors and of Duff Cooper to prevent the International being played among the Allied national anthems) has considerably weakened their position—providing the fight against them is taken up with all severity, but not otherwise.

It follows from the foregoing that it is waste of time, and worse, to argue and chatter about the precise degree of reactionary Toryism still animating Churchill or other individual members of his Cabinet or Government machine. What does matter is to test it out before the British working class, by taking the pledges of Churchill and Eden, holding them strictly to those pledges and carrying on a merciless struggle against the anti-Soviet saboteurs. Everything depends, that is to say, not upon our opinion of how great are the difficulties which we shall encounter, but upon how the fight against those difficulties is organised. The more determined the fight, the more successfully a unique situation can be employed to the greater advantage of the peoples of the whole world. And for this the primary responsibility falls on the best, the most stable and reliable and the most whole-hearted fighters of the British working class—the Communists.

The fight to organise the common struggle with the Soviet Union is waged for the people, whether in production, in the armed forces, in the streets, or in other organisations; and not for Churchill or the Churchill Government. But if Churchill takes measures to come closer to the U.S.S.R., to give effective military help to the U.S.S.R. and to clear out the influences of pro-Nazi and anti-Soviet defeatism, then we support Churchill as we support the Soviet-British people's war. The leadership of that war has already in large measure passed out of the hands of the British ruling class into the hands of the U.S.S.R. The fate of all Europe is bound up with that of the Red Army, not with the side-shows in Libya or Syria, or even with the pressure of the R.A.F. in the West. The more that the active elements of the British people, co-operating with the Communist Party, neutralise and destroy anti-Soviet influences in Britain, the more effective will Soviet leadership of the war become, the safer will be the British people and the peoples of the colonies no less than the peoples of the U.S.S.R., and the greater the certainty of a crushing defeat and destruction for Hitler and Hitlerism everywhere.

Thus this new and epochmaking phase of the war has brought the U.S.S.R. forward into a new and supreme role—that of leader of the world's peoples in battle, no longer only in peaceful social progress and transformation. This new role of the U.S.S.R. shows itself in a thousand details, of which the most vivid and easily understood are naturally military in character. Is it by accident that the first great exposition of the tank battle, meeting the crushing force of Hitler's armoured divisions with still greater force, has come from the U.S.S.R.? Is it by chance that it was the Soviet Union which, in spite of all Goebbels' boasting, proved to be equipped with an air force capable from the very first moment of grappling with the tremendous striking power of the German air arm? Is it purely some national characteristic that the Soviet communiqués from the outset gave such prominence to the heroic achievements of the individual Red fighter? Is it an accident, again, that since the days of the Paris Commune there has been never anything remotely suggesting the ardent and indomitable will to fight and destroy every Nazi soldier animating the armed peoples of the U.S.S.R., the tens of millions of civilian men, women and children who have already given thousands of lives in combat with the invader? Indeed, even the Commune's glorious pages can offer only a remote suggestion of this particular phase of the war; to contrast the "stay put in case of invasion" leaflet issued by the British authorities, with the amazing story of the defence of Libau by its people down to the very children, is evidence enough. None of these things would be possible, did not the U.S.S.R. stand out above all other peoples as a new kind of State, with a new kind of citizen, a new kind of Government, pointing the way to all other peoples.

The campaign for the joint struggle of the British people and the Soviet Union now demands the utmost energies and greatest efforts of will of every class-conscious worker and every friend of freedom. On the present members of the Communist Party and on the tens of thousands now waiting to join its ranks, devolves the historic responsibility of organising that campaign.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Freedom's Battle

BY V. K. KRISHNA MENON

WHAT IS the role of the Indian and other colonial peoples in the titanic struggle that now rages?

The embattled ranks of the free Soviet people, their formidable weapons, their impenetrable armour of steel and will, hold in deadly combat the ruthless and aggressive might of Nazi imperialism. That eighteen hundred mile battle-front witnesses not only the most gigantic engagements in human history and great feats of daring and strategy, but the grim determination of a united people, who give battle or scorch their earth to destroy Fascism so that it may never rise again.

The attack on the Soviet Union aroused the spontaneous solidarity of vast sections of people in every country in the world, not excluding those now part of the greater Reich. Germans and Finns, goaded into battle by their Nazi masters, have deserted and sought their liberation in the ranks of the "enemy." Not Quislings, not traitors or hirelings, but pronounced anti-Fascists and democrats lead this response.

Nowhere has this response been more spontaneous, more extensive or more deep-sprung than among the colonial peoples. Subject; they yearn and strive passionately for freedom which to them is the greatest of all realities. To them the victory of the Soviet Union is not merely the hope of freedom, but the guarantee of its achievement. They realise that the Soviet people have unfailingly recognised the common interests of the peoples of the world. The passions of deadly war have not shaken the Soviet people in this basic knowledge and belief; their leaders have proclaimed that the Soviet Union has faithful allies among the peoples of the world, not excluding the German people. The subject people know that the U.S.S.R. has no imperialist interests, she wages no war on any people, and covets no territories. Where rulers and exploiters have led people into war against the Soviet Union, she has brought the conflict to a victorious conclusion not only for herself, but for the people of the other country, whom she has often liberated.

The Soviet Union has consistently championed the struggles for national independence and the autonomy of nationalities. Her own liberation from Tsarist tyranny and the dawn of a fuller life for 180 million people, not "welded" into a "nation," but members of a free and powerful fraternity, has given great inspiration to the colonial peoples, and stirred the masses in these oppressed lands to new hopes and sustained endeavour. It has also inspired and enabled national movements of liberation to recognise their role and seek to play their part in a freer world and in the world struggle for people's freedom.

In India, the national movement has reached a high stage of political development. It commands the allegiance of the overwhelming majority of the Indian people. It offers fearless and unremitting resistance to imperial domination. It has well defined objectives. It has maintained and advanced national unity in India in the face of all attacks and subterfuges by interested parties.

This alone would not, however, entitle it to claim political maturity in the present-day world. The clear recognition that the national struggle is part of the struggle for a freer world, that India and her people, even though powerless to commit or to control their government, must declare themselves in relation to world affairs is integral to the policies and programmes of the Indian national movement.

The rise of Fascism in Europe and Asia, its depredations and its allies, its increasing threat, actual and potential, to the peoples of the world, aroused deep concern in India. Soon—and sooner than in most countries of the West—it resulted in decisive alignments and prodigious mass activity. The participation in the world anti-Fascist front became integral to policy, which attained increasing clarity in formulation as the world struggle developed. Their hostility to Fascism has been enduring and intense. The support of the peoples' struggle in China and Spain and the mass solidarity with those peoples is one of the major chapters of recent Indian history. Equally, the Indian people have declared their determination to resist imperialist war or commitments imposed on them without their consent and free co-operation.

In September, 1939, the British Gov-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment declared India a belligerent country without consent or consultation, thus deliberately flouting public opinion. Legislation in Parliament and Ordinances in India further restricted the narrow sphere and competence of the provincial governments and substantially increased the enormous powers of the Viceroy. The numerous Ordinances promulgated affect every aspect of Indian life and provide for extreme penalties. In a few weeks, thousands of men and women of the National peasant and working class movement were rounded and put into prison, although no general resistance had been declared.

The Congress asked the British government, on the 14th September, 1939, to declare its purposes and to apply to India and to the colonial peoples the principles of liberty and national Independence to vindicate which it claimed to be waging war against the Nazis. There is no section of Indian opinion that is not anti-Nazi, and none more passionately so than the popular movements. Even the British Government and other detractors have repeatedly admitted that the Indian people are passionately anti-Fascist.

Nazi-propaganda has found Indian soil barren. The Fuhrer-von-Indian, now in an internment camp, stumped the country, thanks to official benevolence. Sir Reginald Maxwell, of the Indian Government, considers even now that the Nazis are better people than the brave Indian anti-Fascists whom it has put into concentration camps. The pro-Fascist elements in India are to be found among the young bloods of the European Associations and in other high places. It is they who have been armed—virtually a private army of a class.

The British Government, however, rode roughshod over Indian opinion, refused every reasonable request, imposed more Ordinances and behaved as though this war was its exclusive concern! There was no pretence in India that it was a people's war! Indeed, British Statesmen spoke of the "freedom of Europe."

In the twelve months which followed the declaration of India's belligerency, the Indian national movement strove patiently and tenaciously to obtain the release of the forces of freedom in India. Yet the Government ignored the vital claim of the Indian people that they were entitled to play their part as a free people in world affairs. It chose to rely on the time-honoured weapons, coercion, "divide and rule," misrepresentation, and on its Quislings.

Having rejected the proposals of the Indian National Congress, the Government fell back on its discredited devices, and offered a plan for enlarging the Viceroy's Executive Council by the appointment of representatives of the "great political parties" to it. It also proposed an advisory committee of a larger size to enable India to assist in the war effort. The Congress ignored the British proposal, other political parties expressed disappointment and anger. Months passed, the scheme had no sponsors or supporters in India. Autocracy, which had obtained now over the larger part of India, increased coercion for war purposes, more imprisonments and suppression continued.

The final break between the Congress and the Government could not be postponed. In October, 1940, Congress embarked on civil disobedience, severely restricted at first, and later extended, but only by selected individuals. Nehru was arrested and sentenced to four years' imprisonment for speeches made to the peasantry at Gorakhpur, "illiterate villagers and therefore highly inflamable material," said the Magistrate. Others followed, almost all leaders of the Congress, former Congress Ministers and the majority of Congress members of legislatures. In a few months the number swelled, though resistance was still strictly controlled by Mr. Ghandi, and at the end of May there were twenty thousand men and women in prison for their advocacy of the Congress cause. In addition there are over 800 in concentration camps, among them well-known Socialists and Communists; Hindus, Moslems, men and women, students, peasants, workers, leaders, followers, and every one of them a convinced anti-Fascist. The penalisation of opinion, of pro-Soviet views, of agitation for improvement of standards of life and wages of workers, restrictions on the Press, and an insistently directed hostility to working class, Communist, student and peasant leaders is a feature of the nation-wide repression that now obtains.

Such is the disastrous spectacle that is the consequence of British policy in India to-day. *Men who should be lead-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the fight against Nazism are in British prisons, those who could mobilise the vital forces of freedom in India for world freedom are languishing in jails and concentration camps, subject to humiliation and much cruelty.

This does not complete the picture. More and heavier burdens have been placed on the peasantry. Price fixing Ordinances hit the producers hard while the cost of living rises and the prices of imported goods soar. The war effort sees India selling raw material at controlled prices and buying imported goods at high prices. Raw produce such as jute, corn and grain lie unsold and unexported owing to the loss of markets and Ordinance regulations. Distress increases. Large scale strikes and peasant demonstrations have vastly increased. In spite of the war and the great needs of war production, Indian industrial development is surprisingly limited, taking all-round figures.

All this is not the picture of an unhappy past which we may, without loss forget, but is the stark reality. It is believed that the British Government, having failed to secure any support for its plan in India, is about to impose it. * It may then be proclaimed to the world that Indian co-operation has now been secured, but facts will contradict the claim. The Government plan is as futile as it is dangerous.

Meanwhile, world events move with unprecedented rapidity. No event in our time so emphatically proclaims the compelling nature of the new situation as the Anglo-Soviet Alliance. There have been Russo-British alliances before, open and secret. Some of them are the more sinister chapters of European history. They were the alliances of two empires (and of Royal relations) against a newer and more energetic rival. An alliance between the Soviet Union and Britain is a fundamentally different arrangement. Indeed, it was this difference that stood so adamantly in the way of such an alliance in the days prior to the war and made the opposition to it their corner stone of Imperial foreign policy and insisted on its maintenance till the entire world situation was transformed by the Soviet Union leaping to arms as the effective champion of resistance to Nazism in its path of world Empire. Britain is not now in alliance with the Russia of the Czars, not with another empire who equally seeks with the defeat of a rival imperialism, but with a mighty people's State, which is the antithesis of Empire. The Soviet Union seeks no territories or imperial gains of trade or commerce or colonisation. The civilisation which it is fighting to defend is incompatible with the domination of peoples at home or abroad, or with participation in world imperialism. Its role is as that of the leader and the bulwark of the people against world empire, which is Hitler's objective. It transforms the character of the world struggle to the colonial peoples.

Nazi imperialism has hurled itself against the mightiest bulwark which stands between it and world domination. Its challenge summons the peoples of the world to action. It calls for the fullest mobilisation of all the forces of freedom everywhere. Nowhere are those forces so vital, so awaiting release, so ready to take a place in the world-front against Nazism as in India. The Indian people are aware of the basic purposes of the U.S.S.R. and her contribution to world peace and national independence. They are conscious of the newer and vital elements which have now entered this world-battle. They know that the battlefront is no mere Russo-German battlefront. Their enslavement alone hampers the fulfilment of the task which the world situation demands from them. From this bondage they must secure their release. That release is no mere national ambition, it is no exclusive national concern or destiny. It is part of common world purposes.

Every practical consideration, every moral argument, every reasonable calculation points to the conclusion that the emancipation of India is now supremely imperative. There are no insurmountable obstacles to the establishment of free co-operation with India. It is too late in the day to argue that there are minorities which bar the establishment of Independence. By that token Poland Czechoslovakia and Syria would all be condemned to subjection. Nor can it be contended seriously that it takes twenty-eight years to make a General and that India, therefore, could not defend herself. Soviet achievement, China and Spain, and on the opposite side France, in recent years, have discredited this argument.

At this historic hour, freedom's battle

* The forecast here given was borne out by Mr. Amery's announcement in parliament on 22nd July.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

calls for the fullest mobilisation of Britain's moral and material resources. It calls for the release of all the forces now enchained, crippled or stultified by narrow and sectional interests of privilege, profit or empire.

The suppression of India is one of the major factors in the present situation. It diverts the energies of the British from the field of the real battle of the British people. It confuses British purposes and makes it less capable of that wide acceptance which is imperative at this juncture. It hampers the Indian people from playing their significant part in the world struggle for people's freedom.

Release India! Release India for freedom's battle!

July 20th, 1941.

The 'Daily Worker' and the National Front

BY WILLIAM RUST

"A free Press is the unsleeping guardian of every other right that free men prize: it is the most dangerous foe of tyranny. No wonder, then, that the great democracies have always been quick to resent any attempt to limit its independence or to bring it under regulation. Sometimes, no doubt, the liberty of the Press is abused, but the ordinary process of the courts and the frown of public opinion are, on the whole, sufficient safeguards against muck-raking and mischief.

"The newspapers, however, fail in their duty when they allow either mass prejudice or the fear of prosecution to prevent them from printing what they believe to be the truth." (Mr. Winston Churchill, *Sunday Chronicle*, 12.1.1936).

THE MERGING of the struggle of the British and Soviet peoples against German Fascism, described by Prime Minister Churchill as a turning point in the war, has given a marked impetus to the strivings of the masses for the creation of an anti-Fascist front. One of the first results of this development of mass activity is an enormous and spontaneous strengthening of the demand for the lifting of the ban on the "Daily Worker," which has become one of the popular issues of the day. Even before the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union, the campaign against the ban, tenaciously conducted by the "Daily Worker" Defence Leagues, had been gaining many new adherents, especially among the trade unions. On June 20th, the National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, composed of delegates recently elected and representing 600,000 organised engineering workers, passed an anti-ban resolution by 43 votes to 4. After Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, this steadily growing movement burst into a storm of protest.

The lifting of the ban is no longer regarded as a political question which concerns only the left-wing of the Labour movement. The demand is supported by all those who believe that the freedom of the Press is an essential condition for the mobilisation of the people in the fight against Fascism. This view is strikingly expressed in the following message from the Bishop of Bradford:—

"I am all in favour of the freedom of the Press. I pass *no criticism* on the banning of the "Daily Worker," since I knew nothing of the circumstances which led the Government to take that action at the time. But I think it would be a mistake to keep on the ban one moment longer than is necessary. As an antagonist to Fascism, open or concealed, in Europe or in England, the "Daily Worker" can do great service to the national cause, and it expresses a point of view which, whether one agrees with it or not, has a *right to be expressed now*, when every resource of British opinion against Fascism should be mobilised in a struggle which is more a struggle against a system than against a people. I hope your protest will help to convince the Government that it is time for the ban on the "Daily Worker" to be lifted."

Men and women in all walks of life are in favour of the re-publication of the paper. They include many Members of Parliament and several Fleet Street editors, as well as trade union leaders and shop stewards. Such well-known literary and artistic figures as J.B. Priestley, Augustus John, H. W. Nevinson and Mrs. Cecil Chesterton have written to the Press in favour of the ban being raised. Several newspapers and journals have come out editorially against the ban, following the lead of the "News Chronicle," which is to-day making a powerful contribution to the anti-Fascist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause of the people. In an anti-ban editorial, the "Manchester Guardian" asks: "Why not let us have the benefit of their lively critical minds?" The "New Statesman" holds that the re-appearance of the "Daily Worker" will help production, because of the "energetic and single-minded" attitude of the Communists.

The demand for the lifting of the ban is naturally strongest amongst the organised workers in the factories and trade unions. Very many of the resolutions passed by them in solidarity with the Soviet Union also extend full support to the "Daily Worker." Sixteen national trade union bodies, including some of the largest unions in the country, have declared against the ban. Most remarkable is the ready sympathy accorded by the co-operative movement, shown in the fact that thirty co-operative societies, with a total membership of 1,050,274, are supporting the demand. Then there are 74 trades councils, including some of the most important in the country, such as Glasgow, Birmingham, Birkenhead, Hull, Newcastle, Derby, Barrow and Bradford. To these can be added 76 factory councils and over 20 trade union district committees. At one colliery in Lancashire an anti-ban petition was signed by all the members of the Home Guard Company. The Press Freedom Conference organised by the National Council for Civil Liberties and the National Union of Journalists in June last, and attended by 992 delegates representing organisations with an aggregate membership of 1,018,250, included in its resolution a demand that Defence Regulation 2D should be repealed and that the repeal should be made retrospective in order to provide for the re-publication of the "Daily Worker."

This summary provides a picture of the widespread character of the anti-ban demand, and the extremely broad section of popular opinion in this country that it represents. It is an opinion that a Government conscious of its democratic obligations cannot possibly ignore. The former Editorial Board of the "Daily Worker" has taken every possible step to facilitate the raising of the ban. It has stated that the old controversies which arose out of the act and method of suppression in January last no longer exist in the entirely new international situation of to-day. Only those people whose anti-Fascism is of a doubtful brand, or those who have some party axe to grind, would dream of indulging in political recrimination at this moment, when the future of the British people, their freedom and independence, is at stake. No purpose would be served to-day by the passing of strictures on the Ministers responsible for the ban, or by claiming, in the event of the ban being removed, that a victory has been won over the Government.

If undertakings and assurances are required, the "Daily Worker" is prepared to give them, providing they are not inconsistent with the traditions of the freedom of the Press. The "Daily Worker" has publicly stated that it will:—

(1) Give its full support to the Government and do everything possible to strengthen British-Soviet unity in the fight to bring about a people's victory over German Fascism;

(2) Direct its influence in the factories, mines and trade unions, towards securing the maximum production for victory;

(3) Handle international affairs from the standpoint of encouraging the liberation fight of the people in the countries enslaved by German Fascism.

Together with its political fight on this platform, the "Daily Worker" will, of course, continue to defend the living standards and democratic rights of the people, as it has never believed that the fight against Fascism can be conducted by people whose bodies are starved and whose minds are in chains.

The "Daily Telegraph" is one of the few newspapers that have polemised against the demand that the suppression order be withdrawn. It took the view that the "Daily Worker" was rightly suppressed for impeding the war effort, and that re-publication is undesirable even though the paper will do everything possible to assist production, as its influence is of no importance. This argument supplies its own answer. If the "Daily Worker" was suppressed in January for its allegedly dangerous influence, then it cannot be logically claimed in July, at a moment when millions are asking for it to re-appear, that it is an insignificant and uninfluential sheet of no importance. If this were really the case, the Editor of the "Daily Telegraph" would not have been instigated to publish an article on the subject.

Like all other newspapers, the "Daily Telegraph" is deeply concerned with the problem of production, and the grave situation in war industries, revealed by the statement of the Chairman of the Select Committee on National Expendi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture that present production is only 75% of capacity. The 'Daily Telegraph,' moreover, recognises, although it comes to an unfavourable conclusion, that the question of the "Daily Worker" is linked up in the public mind with the consideration now being given to the ways and means of solving this vital problem. The fact that the representatives of the men in the arms factories are so overwhelmingly in favour of the lifting of the ban, ought to be taken, without further argument, as a proof that the "Daily Worker" has a very big and positive part to play in workshop affairs. Certain newspapers and Members of Parliament have made prejudiced and violent charges against the workers, as if the present lamentable state of affairs in industry arises solely from absenteeism; but the Press, as a whole, displays a better balance. Production is understood to be a complicated and many-sided problem, it is a political as well as an economic issue. In many factories the workers are impeded by mismanagement and inefficiency, hours of idleness have an extremely depressing effect and are calculated to sap morale. These experiences and the distrust of many workers in the Government, because of its failure to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union in the past period, have had an effect which cannot be wiped out overnight. Whatever measures the Government now takes of an administrative character regarding the co-ordination of production, there is no doubt that the solution to the problem basically depends upon the arousing of the enthusiasm and initiative of the workers. So, whilst it is true that the circulation of the "Daily Worker" was quite small in relation to the big national dailies, it is the one paper that had a decisive influence amongst the active workers in the factories, and it can deal with the factory issues better than any other newspaper. That is one overwhelming argument in favour of re-publication.

At the time of its suppression, the "Daily Worker" was actually conducting a campaign exposing the sorry state of affairs in the war industries, and encouraging the attempts of the workers to secure a remedy. On the day of its suppression, the "Daily Worker" carried a leading article which, after declaring that "war production is in a parlous condition," went on to state that:—

> "Indeed, the workers have done their utmost to end the waste and inefficiency. Faced with the fact that in factory after factory thousands of labour hours are being lost every week due to the criminal neglect of the employers, the workers have made innumerable protests and have sent many deputations to managers and Ministers. . . . If the Communists are strong in the factories, it is certainly not because they are the apostles of strikes for the sake of strikes. Such feather-brained individuals would command neither respect nor influence. The Communists are the defenders of trade unionism, the rights of the workers and of established practices and customs."
>
> (Jan. 21, 1941).

There is no doubt what a paper with this record would be able to do to-day in the national effort to secure maximum production for a victory over Fascism. This fight to secure increased production will, of course, go on, whether the ban is lifted or not, as witness the vigorous advocacy contained in the four-page broadsheet, entitled "Victory over Fascism," which was prepared by former members of the "Daily Worker" staff.

In view of the deplorable state of affairs in the Ministry of Information, and the continual changes in direction, which are an admission that even after nearly two years of war the Government has not yet captured the art of political warfare, we may be permitted to point out that the "Daily Worker" has also a very important contribution to make in this sphere. The success of the Soviet Information Bureau and the powerful and moving messages that it has directed to the people of Germany (an outstanding example of which is the broadcast to Erna Kremer), proves what can be done by propaganda that is organised by those who understand the people and can speak their language. During its eleven years of existence, the "Daily Worker" built up a close comradeship with important sections of the workers in those countries which are now enslaved by the Nazi gangsters. It helped to organise the International Brigade, and indeed, four members of its staff died fighting in its ranks. The reappearance of the "Daily Worker" would help to strengthen the living contact between the British people and the enslaved peoples on the Continent; it would help to destroy the bad impressions of the past propaganda amongst those peoples to whom the V sign is not only an expression of their desire for victory, but also a reminder of Vansittart and Versailles.

We are so confident that the raising of the ban cannot be long avoided that the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary arrangements have already been made for the printing of the paper, despite the fact that the "Daily Worker" building and all of its presses were destroyed by Hitler's fire-bombs last April. This optimism is fully justified by the strength of the mass movement. The Executive of the South Wales Miners' Federation is still pursuing its efforts to persuade the Home Secretary to review the ban. Also the Ayr Conference of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain decided to remit the question of the "Daily Worker" to the E.C., which will undoubtedly act promptly in the matter. Although Mr. Morrison is not willing to receive a deputation on the subject, he is ready to give consideration to a written statement from the S.W.M.F., stating the case for the raising of the ban. If these efforts continue to receive the unflagging support of the workers in the factories and trade unions, and of all those people who stand for a free Press to fight Fascism, there is no doubt that the national front will shortly obtain a welcome accession of strength in the form of a daily newspaper whose single purpose will be the defence of the national independence of the British people and the final extermination of Fascism.

ON TO FIVE HUNDRED!

The number of Discussion Groups is still growing. We have had twenty-three new Groups reported to us this month. OUR AIM IS FIVE HUNDRED! Have you a Discussion Group in your town, workshop, housing block or street? Now is the time to get one going. Write to us at the undermentioned address. We shall be glad to help you and give you any information on these Groups. Do not lag behind. Let your Group be in the next list.

¶ Remember the suggestion to organise educational meeting on "Russia."

Space now forbids our giving a full list of Groups each month—a full list was given in our June issue. The following places are where Groups have been formed during the last two months only.

Aberdeen	Crosskeys	Horsham	Shawlands
Ashby-De-La-Zouch	Dartmouth	Ilford	Slough
Alexandria	Dulwich	Iver	Southall
Abertillery	Dunbarton	Leyland	Southampton
Bacup	Dunstable	Llanelly	Stamford Hill
Barking	Edinburgh	Maldon	Stockport
Bedford	Epsom	Marple	Stoke-on-Trent
Bilston	Gainsborough	Mitcham	Stone
Birkenhead	Gloucester	Nantwich	Streatham
Bletchley	Hampstead	Newark	Stroud
Brentwood	Hanworth	Newcastle (Staffs)	Sutton Coldfield
Bury	Harrow North and Rayners Lane	Newdigate	Walsall
Burry Port	Hatfield	Newton (Man.)	Welling
Cardigan	Hereford	North Kensington	Winchester
Caterham	Heston	Northolt	Wolverhampton
Catford	Hertford	Pinner	Woodford Bridge
Chingford	Hillingdon	Plumstead	Wood Green
Clapton	Hitchin	Ruislip	Worcester
Cleethorpes	Hornsey	Saltcoats	Worksop
Coulsdon		Scunthorpe	

SPECIAL NOTICE

One of our readers has very generously given us a Birthday Gift of a set of Bound Volumes of Labour Monthly for the best Discussion Group, and we have inaugurated a contest, particulars of which the present Groups have already received. This, however, is open to all Groups until the end of the year, and it is therefore possible for all new Groups to take part in this contest.

Special Discussion Notes on each issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY are prepared by the Groups Department and sent to every Convenor. These form an invaluable basis for the study of each issue. These are also available to individual readers at the price of 3s. 0d. per annum.

Please address any enquiries to Discussion Groups Department, 134, Ballards Lane, N.3. We shall be delighted to help you.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Donations Received during July, 1941

£109 : 13 : 7

We are delighted with our "un-birthday presents," which most of the gifts recorded on this page represent; just a few were belated birthday offerings just too late to be included in our last month's superb total. We now confidently look forward to a regularly increasing monthly total, until with our coming-of-age next year we reach astronomical figures.

One unusual and slightly dampening activity we had to carry out this month: the sending of money back. Not to Fund Donors—of course not! But to 300 and more eager applicants for tickets for our Twentieth Birthday Gala and Film Show on July 19th. As we go to Press this is about to take place—if you couldn't get in, we are sorry. Next time we'll take the Albert Hall!!

H. B. Morton, 2s. 6d.; Cradle Group, 5s. 9d.; E.P., £1; D. F. Lawden, £1; Grateful Sympathiser, 10s.; G.F.B., 5s.; A Few Rebels, 10s.; R. Bell, 7s. 6d.; T. M. Brown, 2s. 6d.; J. Fernie, 10s.; J. G. Barker, 7s. 6d.; R. Trowell, 2s. 6d.; Anon, 6s.; M.C., Ayr, 3s. 6d.; P. Hall, 6s.; Clifton Group, 9s. 2d.; M. Uren, 10s.; W. D. Parker, £1; E. Ashworth, 2s. 6d.; Pinner Group, 4s.; Welwyn District Group, £1; E. N. Pratt, £1; E. J. Stout, 5s.; P. Kilpatrick, 5s.; Stourbridge Group, 3s. 9d.; F. N. Strange, 2s. 6d.; M. Mitchell, £1; H. M. Horne, 2s. 6d.; G. Holland, 5s.; F. Ray, 2s.; "One Year," 10s.; Permanent Reader, 3s. 6d.; Anon, 5s.; H. L. Higgs, £1; R. Pearson, 2s. 6d.; M. Morgan, 10s.; W. Lewington, 6s.; Epsom Group, 2s.; R.R., N.W.3, £1; T. J. Despicht, 1s. 3d.; M. Minnion, 6s. 3d.; J. R. Horth, 2s.; J. F. Yeomans, 2s. 6d.; E. Farnworth, 2s. 6d.; Windsor People's Convention Group, 7s. 6d.; N. Finchley Group, 5s. 6d.; Bristol E.C.P., 5s.; E. Midgley, 10s.; J. Ruddock, 7s. 6d.; V. Wilson, 1s. 3d.; W. McGregor and Son, £2; M. Hawley, 2s. 6d.; Mrs. MacMillan, 1s. 3d.; L.G.P., 2s. 6d.; Chorlton C.P., 5s.; D.R., Southport, £1; A. Holderness, 1s.; D. Mitchell, 10s.; Anon, Epsom, 5s.; Red Circ, 1s. 6d.; J. Hill, 10s.; M. Howard, 5s.; Subscriber, Redhill, 5s.; Altrincham C.P., 11s.; F. H. Rocks, 5s.; Llanelly Group, 9s.; D. Robinson, 4s.; D. Gardner, 2s.; R. Jardine, £6 10s.; R.G.B., £3 3s.; F. Bernard, 4s. 4d.; G. F. Smith, £1; Few Readers, Merton, 8s.; W. D. Coleman, 2s.; Rev. W. B. Thomas, 1s.; A. F. Perrin, 5s.; "Bedford," 4s.; I. Thomas, 6s. 3d.; M. Southerden, 3s. 9d.; R. Bell, 1s.; Kay, Harrogate, 3s.; Aberdeen Group, £1; A Comrade, 5s.; J. Gouldsmith, £1; F. H. Powell, Jnr., 2s. 6d.; S. G. Nowell, 1s. 6d.; Grantham Group, 15s.; Group of Foreign Workers, 16s.; H. Lynford, 10s.; Aberdeen Transport D.G., 1s.; Gunn, 13s.; C. Hunter, 4s.; A. Downing, 2s. 6d.; J. Hookey, 2s.; F. Thomas, 12s. 7d.; C. Tarling, 4s.; Mr. Carter, £1; Only a Private, 10s.; R. Stevenson, 13s. 6d.; Dartford C.P., 10s.; Comrade in Forces, 7s.; Two Comrades, £5; Clapton Reader, 10s.; Alston, 5s.; Willesden Junction Railway Committee, 10s.; C. Davis, Colln., 11s. 6d.; Q., Manchester, 10s.; G. Blake, £1; M. James, 10s.; F. A. Hargreaves, 2s. 6d.; J. Fernie, 2s. 6d.; S. Munsie, 7s. 6d.; Q.Z., 4s.; A. Drummond, 5s.; Private Soldier, 5s.; A. Hulme, 6d.; Four Red R.A.F. Corporals, £1; Red Chemist, 10s.; E. J. O. Barnes, 1s. 6d.; V. Carne, £2; "Birthday," Gosport, 4s. 5d.; Red Infantry Men, 12s.; Anon, Reading, £1; Islington C.P., £2; Red N.C.O., 2s. 6d.; The Household, £1; "Bedford," 5s.; M.E.B., 6s.; C. Cuttriss, 10s.; Harpenden Group, 15s. 6d.; J. Bateman, 5s.; J. MacQueen, 10s.; Reader, N/C 4, 5s.; E.P., £1; Cradle Group, 6s.; S. E. Cooks, 10s.; Penrith Group, 5s.; T. Morris, 10s.; Stourbridge Group, 2s. 3d.; Corporal, 5s.; Ronald Deer, 1s.; Chorlton-cum-Hardy Group, 4s.; R.R., £1; V. M. Sargent, 6s. 6d.; G. M. Hartley, 1s. 5d.; Winchmore Hill Group, 6s.; H.S., 2s. 6d.; E. W. Pates, 10s.; Willesden Group 6s. 6d.; Red N.C.O., 10s.; Highgate Group, £1; R.F.B., £2; Anon, Maidenhead, 2s.; Anon, Whitchurch, 1s.; J. V. Keen, 10s.; Redruth and Camborne Readers, £1 8s.; Anon, Cambridge, £2; Enfield Group, 14s.; Red Corporal, £1 10s.; H.F.B., 5s.; Gruzya Uchitiellya, 15s.; J.L.J., £1; C. A. Moore, 3s.; Banstead Group, 7s. 6d.; H. Newcombe, 5s.; J. B. Wilks, 5s.; Woodford Group, 10s.; Duine, £1 5s.; Sheffield Bookshop, 1s. 6d.; W. F. Lakin-Smith, 2s.; F. Potter, 3s.; T. J. Harding, 3s. 5d.; E. A. Johnston, 2s. 6d.; M.J., 5s.; Kaye Brutton, 2s. 6d.; J. Gaunt, 1s. 3d.; Jarrow and Hepburn Readers, 4s.; F. Scaife, 15s.; P. Coogan, 10s.; M. J. Carritt, £1; E. D. McCallum, 5s.; Fishponds C.P., 5s.; A.4, £1; J. Geddes, 10s.; Anon, Grange-over-Sands, 3s.; A.V., 2s.; R.W.G., 10s.; Four Red Soldiers, 15s.; Seaman Gunner, £1; Stoke-on-Trent Group, 2s. 6d.; A.R.M., 5s.; J. T. Buchanan, 1s.; Mary Christopher, 2s. 6d.; R. Barrett, 10s.; Searchlight Bill, 2s. 6d.; Q.Z., 4s.; Hyde Group, 10s.; Anon, Kidderminster, 10s.; Orpington Group, 5s.; L.M.F., 16s. 3d.; N.C.O., 1s.; J. W. Gray, 10s.; N. Kelly, 5s.; Champ, 2s.; Socialist Soldier, 10s.; Prestatyn Pals, 13s. 6d.; Red Airman, 10s.; Anon, Leytonstone, 12s. 6d.; Air Gunner, 3s.; T. W. Oliver, 13s.; J.B., 5s.; More Red N.C.O.'s, 5s.; Welwyn G.C. Group, £1 7s. 6d.; B. Saunders, 2s.; H. Frith, 3s. 6d.; R. L. Thatcher, 1s.; A. G. H. Moor, 2s. 6d.; Edgware Group, 3s.; E., 2s. 6d.; J. W. Potter, 2s. 6d.; Stressman, 10s.; K. H. Evans, 5s.; H.S.M., 3s. 6d.; R.R. (N.W.11), 10s.; R. Pearson, 2s. 6d.; Bacon Family, 3s. A. Seaman Hawkins, £1; "Better Late Than Never" (with belated Birthday Greetings) 5s.

STOP PRESS ! ! **Collection at the Birthday Gala :—**

£58 : 2 : 3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTICE

on

"Crisis of the British People"

by **R. PALME DUTT**

Readers of "Labour Monthly" who have ordered the Special 3/6 Edition, are hereby notified that in view of the international situation publication of the book is now held up to allow for additional matter and the inclusion of new chapters.

A further announcement will be made next month.

MARK HOUSE SCIENCE FACULTY
is holding a
SYMPOSIUM
on
ENGEL'S "DIALECTICS OF NATURE" AND "ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE STATE"
at the
CAXTON HALL,
Caxton Street, Westminster,
on
August 16th and 17th, 1941.

This Symposium offers a unique opportunity of discussing problems of modern Science and Philosophy in the light of Marxist Theory.

Contributors to the Symposium include: **R. P. ARNOT, PROF. BERNAL, C. P. DUTT, PROF. HALDANE, PROF. LEVY, PROF. THOMSON.**

Admission to all sessions 5/-; single session 1/3. For further particulars apply to The Secretary, Faculty of Science, Marx House, 37a Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.1.

Note: The Symposium will be concluded by a Public Lecture on "DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM."
On Sunday, August 17th, at 7 p.m.
Lecturer: R. PAGE ARNOT.

LENINISM by STALIN

On JULY 4 hundreds of thousands of people read a speech by Stalin for the first time. They were deeply impressed by his courage, his wisdom and his profound conviction. These three qualities, which characterise everything he has written, make him the greatest leader of to-day; a man whose writings especially deserve the attention of every member of the working class movement. *Leninism* is a selection of his most important speeches, lectures and articles from 1924 to 1939.

7/6

Lenin on Britain 3/6

LAWRENCE & WISHART, 2, Southampton Place, W.C.1

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by The Hardy Press, Ltd., Commercial Road, Bournemouth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED